1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNI.	Δ

ARDY MERRITT,

Plaintiff,

٧.

HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 24-cv-03968-MMC

## ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

By order filed July 16, 2024, the Court dismissed the above-titled action for lack of subject matter jurisdiction and, for the same reason, denied plaintiff's motion for an injunction, whereby plaintiff, who proceeds pro se, sought an order enjoining an unlawful detainer proceeding pending in state court.

Now before the Court is plaintiff's "Affidavit in Support of Motion for Reconsideration," filed July 19, 2024, whereby plaintiff seeks reconsideration of the order denying his motion for an injunction. In support of such request, plaintiff provides additional factual detail regarding his contention that the state court made errors in the course of the above-referenced state court action and asserts reconsideration is proper in light of those additional facts.

The Court, having read and considered the motion for reconsideration, rules as follows.

First, the motion is procedurally deficient, as plaintiff has not sought, much less obtained, leave to file a motion for reconsideration, as is required by the Local Rules of this District. See Civil L.R. 7-9(a).

Moreover, the motion fails on its merits. Contrary to plaintiff's argument, the Court

## 

	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20
	8
	9
United States District Court Northern District of California	10
	11
	12
	13
	14
	15
	16
	17
	18
	19
	20
	21
	22
	23
	24
	25
	26
	27

28

1

did not fail to consider material facts before denying the motion for an injunction. Indeed
the motion was not denied due to a lack of facts, but, rather, as was explained in the
Court's prior Order, because district courts lack subject matter jurisdiction to enjoin state
court proceedings. See Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co. v. Brotherhood of Locomotive
Engineers, 398 U.S. 281, 294-95 (1970) (holding district courts lack "power" to "enjoin
state court proceedings").

Accordingly, the motion is hereby DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 26, 2024

MAXINE M. CHESNEY
United States District Judge